

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 25-28 are added in this Reply. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with the Applicant's representative on October 24, 2005.

§ 102 REJECTION – RHOADS, KENNER

Claims 16 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rhoads (USP 5,850,481). *See Final Office Action, item 5.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 16 is amended to explicitly recite feature(s) that were already present implicitly to clarify the invention for the Examiner's benefit. As amended, independent claim 16 recites, in part "wherein the output image data geometrically match with the original picture data in the input image data." At the interview, it was agreed that Rhoads cannot teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, independent claim 16 is distinguishable over Rhoads.

Claim 20-24 depend from independent claim 16 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 20-24 are also distinguishable over Rhoads.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16 and 20-24 based on Rhoads be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – RHOADS, KENNER

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rhoads in view of Kenner et al. (USP 5,956,716). *See Final Office Action, item 7.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 is amended to explicitly recite feature(s) already implicitly present and thus serves to clarify the invention. As amended, claim 1 recites, in part “wherein the processed image data geometrically agree with the original picture in the initial image.” It was agreed during the interview that Rhoads cannot teach or suggest at least this feature. Kenner cannot be relied upon to correct for at least this deficiency of Rhoads. Therefore, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over Rhoads and Kenner.

Independent claim 6 recites, in part “wherein the processed image data geometrically agree with the original picture in the initial image.” Clearly, Rhoads and Kenner cannot teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, independent claim 6 is distinguishable over Rhoads and Kenner.

Independent claim 11 recites, in part “wherein the processed image data geometrically agree with the original picture in the initial image.” Clearly, Rhoads and Kenner cannot teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, independent claim 11 is distinguishable over Rhoads and Kenner.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 depend from independent claim 1, 6 or 11 directly or indirectly. Thus, for at least due to the dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 are also distinguishable over Rhoads and Kenner.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-15 based on Rhoads and Kenner be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIM

Claims 25-28, which depend from independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are added. The new claims are believed to be allowable for at least due to the dependency on the independent claims. Applicant respectfully request that the new claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to

be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 

D. Richard Anderson
Reg. No. 40,439


DRA/HNS

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s):